

the middle of June at the earliest before we could send a bill to the White House.

Pretending otherwise, and promising the victims of these terrible tragedies something else, does a tremendous disservice not only to us and to our institution, but to the very people we are trying to protect.

Our Nation's schoolchildren deserve to attend the safest, most secure schools that we can provide, and the parents of our children should rest secure in the knowledge that everything is being done within our powers, both as citizens and legislators, to create precisely that environment.

This is not the time to play on the fears of our most vulnerable. This is the time for aggressive yet responsible leadership, one in which we can think carefully and examine all of the issues before we go off half-informed, searching for the snappiest sound bite rather than working together to develop the best legislation that we can.

This is one of those rare times when the national consensus demands that we act, but it does not require us to rush to judgment, to risk compounding the situation by stampeding toward what sounds like the best way to score points against each other. We can do better than that, and I am determined to see that we will.

By cooperating, we can get a bill to the White House promptly, while making sure that the policies are ready to be enforced when schools reopen in September. The Nation's eyes have turned towards us, looking for responsible leadership. We must resist the temptation to score political points at the expense of the lives and families of our Nation's children.

Demagoguery for the sake of partisan advantage will not serve the country well, nor will it produce the best legislative solution possible. We have the opportunity to rise above partisanship and do ourselves and our Nation proud. I appeal to all the Members not to let this opportunity slip away.

We have responsible legislation and it is ready to go. It can be made better. Rushing it to the floor this week will not result in a better product in the long run. Let us come together, move forward, and develop the best legislation we can so that all Americans can take pride in how we respond.

THE FUTURE AMERICAN FLAG WILL HAVE 51 STARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Madam Speaker, when the House of Representatives debated legislation on Puerto Rico's self-determination, opponents argued that Puerto Ricans had a different culture, too alien from the rest of the Nation to become a partner.

But they were wrong. The ones that are not mainstream are those that subscribe to a nativist mindset. Have they listened to the radio? Have they watched a ballgame? Have they checked out who is doing art for the Treasury Department, or have they read Time Magazine lately?

Last week's cover of Time featured Puerto Rican pop star Ricky Martin, who boasts the number one song in America. The same article highlighted two other Puerto Rican pop culture success stories, vocalists Mark Anthony and actress-singer Jennifer Lopez.

Last year, baseball's American League recognized Puerto Rican Juan "Igor" Gonzalez of the Texas Rangers as its most valuable player, and 11-year-old Laura Hernandez from Puerto Rico is this year's First Place National Winner of the United States Savings Bond Poster Contest.

Right here next to Washington, D.C., in the Goddard Space Center, there are over 40 engineers and scientists who have come from Puerto Rico. They graduated from MIT; not Massachusetts Institute of Technology, but the Mayaguez Institute of Technology.

Time's May 24th cover story states, "We have seen the future. It looks like Ricky Martin. It sings like Mark Anthony. It dances like Jennifer Lopez. Que bueno." I, too, have seen the future, and I saw our flag with 51 stars. Que bueno.

THE FUTURE OF SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about an important issue for everyone in this country. It is social security. Everybody that is now receiving social security is concerned when Congress starts talking about changes in social security, because the fact is that one-third of the individuals that are now receiving social security depend on that social security check for 90 percent or more of their retirement income, a huge dependency. So it is easy to understand why seniors get nervous.

Everybody that is near retirement age is concerned, because they have planned their retirement and the fact is that social security is running out of money. Those individuals under 55 years of age are the generation most at risk, because they may be asked to spend a lot more paying for the retirement benefits of those that retired before them.

This week we are going to discuss what has been called a lockbox for social security. It does not fix social security, but it provides that Congress promises not to spend the social security trust fund surpluses for other government programs. It is a good start,

but make no mistake, it does nothing to change the fundamentals of the programs and fix social security in the long run.

Briefly, let me describe, what the problems of social security are. When we started the social security program in 1934, it was developed as a pay-as-you-go program, where existing current workers paid in their social security tax for the benefits of existing current retirees, so essentially no savings. The social security taxes went in one week, and by the end of the week they were sent out in benefits to retirees.

The system worked very well in the early stages because there were 42 people working for every 1 retiree receiving those tax benefits. By 1950, the number of people working went down to 17 people working, sending in their social security taxes for every one retiree. Today it is 3 people working, sending in their social security taxes, for every retiree.

The estimate is that by 2030, there are only going to be 2 people working. So what we are asking those 2 people to do, without changes in the social security structure, without changes in the system, we are asking those two workers to try to earn and produce enough for their families plus one retiree; almost impossible.

The Federal Government, since it continues to raise taxes, and it has raised social security taxes 36 times since 1976, more often than once a year. Today 75 percent of our workers pay more in the social security tax than they do in income tax.

But as government raised those taxes on workers, they took the extra money coming in above and beyond what was needed for benefit payments for retirees and the families and the disabled and they spent the money on other government programs.

□ 0915

What that has done is dig us a \$700 billion IOU to future retirees that government, that Congress, that the President has no idea how to pay back.

I plead with my colleagues and, Madam Speaker, I plead with the American people to look at Social Security, look at how it is going to affect their lives and the future if Congress and the President is not willing to step up to the plate and deal with the serious problems of Social Security.

I have a proposal that I will be introducing in the next week that, provided we start slowing down some of the benefits for those high-income retirees and use some of that money for private investment accounts, to put that money into individual accounts so those individuals own that money, instead of Congress spending it on other programs.

Let me just finish by saying what tremendously complicates and should concern all of us in terms of how we deal with Social Security is a Supreme Court decision. In fact, two Supreme Court decisions. The Supreme Court